



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,174	12/27/2000	Liisa Kanniainen	557.302US01	4935
7590	01/14/2005		EXAMINER	
STEVEN R. FUNK CRAWFORD PLLC 1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE, SUITE 390 ST. PAUL, MN 55120			WORJLOH, JALATEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/749,174	KANNIAINEN, LIISA
	Examiner Jalatee Worjoh	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-40 and 51-63 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-40 and 51-63 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 2, 2004, in which claims 56 and 57 were amended and claims 60-63 added.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 2, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, "Morimoto fails to disclose a system that provides a trusted server that operates as an intermediary to facilitate preparation and execution of a contract between the merchant and buyer systems."

However, the examiner disagrees. Morimoto discloses a personal broker-agent (i.e. trusted server) that "may establish prenegotiated agreements with preferred suppliers... the savings may be in part passed on to the purchaser", which is the same as *handling the negotiation of a contract for a transaction between the merchant system and the buyer system*. Thus, the claims remain rejected in view of Morimoto.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 21 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US

Publication No. 2002/0013774 to Morimoto.

Referring to claim 21, Morimoto discloses at least one buyer system for operation by a user desiring to purchase a product, at least one merchant system configured for providing a user the product and sending charging data indicative of a payment amount in consideration for providing the product (see paragraph [0041] & [0042]) and at least one payment system including a trusted server (i.e. “broker-agent server”) and charging engine, for handling the negotiation of a contract for a transaction between the merchant system and the buyer system concerning the product, the trusted server being adapted to prepare the contract (see paragraphs [0012] & [0013]) and facilitate execution of the contract for the transaction between the merchant system and the buyer system (see paragraph [0065]), and the charging engine being adapted to receive and process the charging data for the payment (see claim 29, lines 12-16).

Referring to claim 60, Morimoto discloses a trusted server (i.e. “broker-agent server”), the trusted server configured to prepare a contract for a transaction between a merchant system and a buyer system, the trusted server configured to send the prepared contract to the buyer system for acceptance by a user of the buyer system (see paragraph [0012]), the trusted server configured to receive the accepted contract from the buyer system (see paragraph [0014]) and send the accepted contract to the merchant system whereby the merchant system can initiate the transaction based upon the accepted contract (see paragraph [0013]).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-15, 22-27, 33-40, 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0013774 to Morimoto.

Morimoto discloses a trusted server (i.e. “broker-agent server”), the trusted server prepares a contract for a transaction between a merchant system and a buyer system, sends the prepared contract to the buyer system for acceptance by a user of the buyer system (see paragraph [0012]) and a charging engine for calculating a charge to be paid to the merchant system by the user (see claim 29, lines 12-16). As per the step of returning the accepted contract to the merchant system wherein the merchant system initiates the transaction based upon the accepted contract, Morimoto teaches this process (see paragraph [0013]). Specially, Morimoto teaches the process of conducting an auction, in which the preferred providers are provided with an accepted contract. The merchant that offers the best price and benefits is bind to the accepted contract and initiates the transaction. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to develop a payment system including a trusted server, a merchant system, buyer system and charging engine for online transactions. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces negotiation time and activities by performing time consuming task electronically.

Referring to claims 2 and 37, Morimoto discloses the trusted server identifies whether the merchant system has modified the contract (see paragraph [0014]).

Referring to claim 3, Morimoto discloses the trusted server finalizes the contract (see paragraph [0065]).

Referring to claims 4 and 33, Morimoto discloses the merchant system comprises a web server (see paragraph [0039]).

Referring to claims 5 and 24, Morimoto discloses an interface between the merchant system and the buyer system, the interface including a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) server for the buyer system supporting WAP connection (see paragraph [0066]). Notice, Morimoto discloses utilizing wireless devices for the negotiation process, which suggests that the interface may be a WAP server for WAP connection.

Referring to claims 6-8 and 34-36, Morimoto discloses the charge is for a product and the product comprises at least a portion of a content source, wherein the content source comprises a document; wherein the content source comprises a multimedia object (i.e. “CD”) (see paragraph [0042]).

Referring to claims 9-11 and 38-40, Morimoto discloses the buyer system comprises a mobile terminal; wherein the mobile terminal comprises a web-enabled mobile phone; wherein the buyer system comprises a computer system coupled to the Internet (see paragraph [0066]).

Referring to claims 12 and 23, Morimoto discloses a World Wide Web interface, the interface interfacing the buyer system and the merchant system, i.e. “e-commerce site”, (see paragraph [0038]).

Referring to claims 13 and 25, Morimoto discloses the trusted server receives payment from the buyer system, confirms payment by the buyer system and prevents non-repudiation of the transaction by the buyer system (see paragraph [0054]).

Referring to claims 14 and 26, Morimoto discloses the charging engine receives charging data representing billing information from the merchant system and transfers a charge amount to the buyer system for payment by the buyer system (see paragraph [0063]).

Referring to claims 15 and 27, Morimoto discloses the charging engine converts the received charging data into another form ready to be transferred to the buyer system (see paragraph [0059]).

Referring to claim 22, Morimoto discloses at least one buyer system for operation by a user desiring to purchase a product, at least one merchant system configured for providing a user the product (see paragraph [0041] & [0042]) and at least one payment system including a trusted server (i.e. “broker-agent server”), wherein the payment system handles the negotiation of a contract for a transaction between the merchant system and the buyer system concerning the product, and the trusted server being prepares the contract for the transaction between the merchant system and the buyer system, sends the prepared contract to the buyer system for acceptance by a user of the buyers system (see paragraph [0012]) and a charging engine for calculating a charge to be paid to the merchant system by the user (see claim 29, lines 12-16).

As per the step of returning the accepted contract to the merchant system wherein the merchant system initiates the transaction based upon the accepted contract, Morimoto teaches this process (see paragraph [0013]). Specially, Morimoto teaches the process of conducting an auction, in which the preferred providers are provided with an accepted contract. The merchant that offers

the best price and benefits is bind to the accepted contract and initiates the transaction. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to develop a payment system including a trusted server, a merchant system, buyer system and charging engine for online transactions. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces negotiation time and activities by performing time consuming task electronically.

Referring to claim 51, Morimoto discloses charging data in response to a single event (i.e. after searching for a better price) occurring in accordance with the transaction (see claim 29, lines 12-16).

Referring to claim 52, Morimoto discloses charging data in response to multiple events (i.e. detecting an action, sending and agreeing to the contract and searching for a better price) occurring in accordance with the transaction (see claim 29).

7. Claims 16-19 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto as applied to claims 14 and 22 respectively above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2003/0078862 to Kojima et al.

Referring to claims 16 and 28, Morimoto discloses a charging engine (see claims 14 and 22 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the trusted server receives payment from the buyer system based upon the charge amount and sent to the buyer system, confirms payment by the buyer system and signals to the merchant system that payment has been made. Kojima et al. disclose the trusted server receives payment from the buyer system based upon the charge amount and sent to the buyer system, confirms payment by the buyer system and signals to the merchant system that payment has been made (see paragraph [0008]). At the time the invention

was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to include the trusted server receives payment from the buyer system based upon the charge amount and sent to the buyer system, confirms payment by the buyer system and signals to the merchant system that payment has been made. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do because it provides an indication that the merchant will receive payments for the service provided.

Referring to claims 17-19 and 29-31, Morimoto discloses a trusted server (see claims 1 and 22 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the trusted server provides authentication for the transaction to the buyer system, the authentication for the transaction comprises authentication of the product; the transaction comprises authentication of the merchant system. Kojima et al. disclose the trusted server provides authentication for the transaction to the buyer system and the merchant system (see paragraph [0123]) and authentication for the transaction comprises authentication of the product (see paragraph [0100]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to include the trusted server provides authentication for the transaction to the buyer system, the authentication for the transaction comprises authentication of the product; the transaction comprises authentication of the merchant system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security; thus preventing fraudulent activities.

8. Claims 20 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2002/0107785 to Melchior et al.

Morimoto discloses a buyer system, financial system and merchant system (see claim 1 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose a financial compensation system, the financial compensation system providing financial transaction support to the buyer system and the merchant system for the transaction. Melchior et al. expressly disclose a financial compensation system, the financial compensation system providing financial transaction support to the buyer system and the merchant system for the transaction (see paragraph [0009]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to include expressly disclose a financial compensation system, the financial compensation system providing financial transaction support to the buyer system and the merchant system for the transaction. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides sufficient customer service to the buyer and merchant.

9. Claims 53-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6064987 to Walker et al.

Morimoto discloses a charging engine (see claim 21 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the charging engine processes the charging data to cause the payment to be made in multiple increments. Walker et al. disclose the charging engine processes the charging data to cause the payment to be made in multiple increments (see col. 11, lines 57-65). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to include the charging engine processes the charging data to cause the payment to be made in multiple increments. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides faster means for data transmission.

Referring to claim 54, Morimoto discloses a charging engine (see claim 21 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose multiple increments respectively correspond to multiple events, each of the multiple events occurring in accordance with the transaction. However, this difference is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the system. The charging engine processes the charging data in multiple increments regardless of events. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in term of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *in re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to process the charging data to cause the payment to be made in multiple increments regardless of the events because the multiple events does not functionally relate to charging engine in the system.

Referring to claims 55 and 59, Morimoto discloses the buyer system is adapted to terminate (i.e. “reject”) at least a portion of the multiple events and cause the charging system to cease processing of the charging data and wherein the charging system terminates further buying of the merchant offering in response to a command received from the buyer system (see paragraph [0052]).

Referring 56-58, Morimoto discloses terminating further buying of the merchant offerings after processing the charging data (see [0052]). Morimoto does not expressly disclose ceasing further buyer/merchant/charging system of subsequent merchant offerings after the charging system has processed the charging data for previous merchant offerings, but Morimoto is adapted to perform this intended use limitation. Therefore, the recitation of a new intended

use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to include the process where the buyer/merchant/charging system are adapted to cease further buying of the merchant offerings. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it eliminates fraud.

10. Claims 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto as applied to claim 60 above, and further in view of US Publication NO. 2002/0038292 to Quelene.

Morimoto discloses a trusted server (see claim 60 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the trusted server configured to process charging data representative of buyer charges received from the merchant system. Quelene discloses the trusted server configured to process charging data representative of buyer charges received from the merchant system (see paragraph [[0039]]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to configured the server to process charging data representative of buyer charges received from the merchant system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces negotiation time and activities by allowing the server to process the charging data.

Referring to claim 62, Morimoto discloses a trusted server (see claim 60 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the server configured to validate a buyer signature associated with the accepted contract. Quelene discloses the server configured to validate a

buyer signature associated with the accepted contract (see paragraph [0097]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to configure the server to validate a buyer signature. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides security and reduces fraud.

Referring to claim 63, Morimoto discloses a trusted server (see claim 60 above). Morimoto does not expressly disclose the server configured to manage modification of contract terms. Quelene discloses the server configured to manage modification of contract terms (see paragraph [0017]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system disclose by Morimoto to configure the server to manage modification of contract terms. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides the most updated information.

***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3621

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 703-305-0057. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays 8:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 for Regular/After Final Actions and 703-746-9443 for Non-Official/Draft.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

*Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks*  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, V.A., Seventh floor receptionist.



Jalatee Worjoh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3621

\*\*\*

January 10, 2005



JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600